UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,126	10/25/2001	Kai Tuschner	04899-065001	1388

959 7590 04/04/2006

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/057,126	TUSCHNER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Response to Non-Final Office Action filed January 18, 2006.

This action is made Final.

2. Claims 1-30 remain pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, 19, 23 and 27 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 9-14, 18-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell et al. (U.S. Patent 6269475; date of patent July 31, 2001; filed June 2, 1998) in view of Binnig et al. (U.S. Patent 6792418; date of patent September 14, 2004; filed March 29, 2000).

Regarding independent claim 1, Farrell discloses generating source code corresponding to a block diagram model (col. 5, lines 16-17, 50-55; col. 6, lines 24-26) since Farrell teaches source code comprising codeblocks and forming codeblocks corresponding to an object model.

Farrell further discloses generating links associating elements of the generated source code with elements of the block diagram model (col. 5, lines 50-55) since Farrell teaches source code pointing to an object model. Farrell does not disclose hypertext links. Binnig teaches hypertext links as pointers (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Binnig before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a pointer between code and a model as taught by Farrell to include hypertext links as taught by Binnig, because Farrell teaches pointers between code and a model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Binnig teaches hypertext links used as pointers for linking between entities (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Farrell discloses displaying the source code and pointers on a display and displaying to the user at least a portion of the block diagram model including an element of the model associated with the pointer (Fig. 5, 17; col. 7, lines 30-49; col. 10, lines 7-14) but does not disclose displaying hypertext links. Binnig teaches displaying pointers and hypertext links as pointers (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5; col. 11, lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Binnig before him at the time the invention was

made, to modify displaying source code and pointers as taught by Farrell to include displaying hypertext links as taught by Binnig, because displaying hypertext links, as taught by Binnig (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5; col. 11, lines 33-52) would allow a user to view the links, along with the code, for making selections.

Farrell further discloses receiving input from a user representing a selection of a pointer in the source code (Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 30-49) but does not disclose selecting one of the hypertext links. Binnig teaches selecting hypertext links that act as pointers (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5; col. 11, lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Binnig before him at the time the invention was made, to modify selecting a pointer as taught by Farrell to include selecting hypertext links as taught by Binnig, because Farrell teaches selecting pointers (Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 30-49) and Binnig teaches selecting hypertext links used as pointers for linking between entities (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5; col. 11, lines 33-52).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Farrell discloses displaying the associated element in a highlighted fashion (Fig. 17; col. 10, lines 7-14) since Farrell teaches displaying highlighted elements.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Farrell discloses at least one of the associated elements in the generated source code is a commented reference to a block in the

block diagram model (Fig. 17) since Farrell teaches commented references in the source code.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Farrell discloses at least one of the associated elements in the generated source code is a variable reference in an operative code section (Fig. 6, 7; col. 7, lines 50-67; col. 8, lines 1-5) since Farrell teaches variable references in the source code in operative sections, such as the OtherClass variable.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Farrell discloses the commented reference to a block comprises a character string identifying a path to a file providing information relating to a section of the block (Fig. 17) since Farrell teaches paths to files and classes in the source code.

Regarding independent claims 10, 19 and 23, the claims reflect the system, computer program and processor and memory for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 12, 13, 14 and 18, the claims reflect the system for performing the operations of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 20, 21 and 22, Farrell discloses the computer readable medium is RAM, ROM or hard disk drive (Fig. 20; col. 11, lines 4-8, 30-36).

Regarding dependent claims 24, 25 and 26, Farrell discloses the processor and memory are incorporated into a personal computer, a network server residing in the Internet or a single board computer (Fig. 20; col. 10, lines 57-63; col. 11, lines 50-56).

Regarding independent claim 27, Farrell discloses providing source code identifying an element of a graphical model (col. 5, lines 16-17, 50-55; col. 6, lines 24-26) since Farrell teaches source code comprising codeblocks and forming codeblocks corresponding to elements of an object model.

Farrell further discloses generating a document comprising information about the source code (col. 5, lines 32-36) since Farrell teaches generating an executable code file that contains information about the source code.

Farrell further discloses providing pointers referencing elements of the graphical model (col. 5, lines 50-55) since Farrell teaches source code pointing to an object model. Farrell does not disclose hypertext links. Binnig teaches hypertext links as pointers (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Binnig before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a pointer between code and a model as taught by Farrell to include hypertext links as taught by Binnig, because Farrell teaches pointers between code and a model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Binnig teaches hypertext links used as pointers for linking between entities (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5).

Regarding dependent claims 28 and 29, the claims reflect the method for performing the operations of claims 2, 4 and 9 and are rejected along the same rationale.

4. Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Binnig in further view of Yang (U.S. Pub. No. 20020055891; publication date May 9, 2002; filed August 13, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 6, 7 and 8, Farrell does not disclose the hypertext link is Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML), Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) or Extensible Markup Language (XML). Yang teaches SGML, HTML and XML including hypertext links (p.8, para. 128). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Yang before him at the time the invention was made, to modify links taught by Farrell to SGML, HTML and XML as taught by Yang, because SGML, HTML and XML are constructed in a form including links, as taught by Yang (p.8, para. 128).

Regarding dependent claims 15, 16, 17 and 30, the claims reflect the system and method for performing the operations of claims 6, 7 and 8 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed January 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants indicate that both Farrell and Binnig fail to teach or suggest generating source code corresponding to a block diagram model (p.4, para. 3). The Examiner disagrees because Farrell teaches generating source code from an object model (col. 5, lines 16-17, 50-55; col. 6, lines 24-26). In other words, source code containing codeblocks is generated from and corresponds to each object model.

Applicants further argue that both Farrell and Binnig fail to teach or suggest generating hypertext links associating the source code with the block diagram (p.5, para. 2). The Examiner disagrees because Farrell teaches a pointer from the source code to the object model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Binnig teaches a hypertext link serving as a pointer (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5). In other words, the hypertext link acting as a pointer, as taught in Binnig, could represent the pointer between the source code and model, as taught in Farrell.

Applicants further argue that there is no motivation to combine pointers of a program editor as taught by Farrell with access pointers of a searchable database as taught by Binnig (p.6, para. 1). The Examiner disagrees because Farrell teaches a pointer for linking source code to the object model corresponding to the code (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Binnig teaches a pointer, in the form of a hypertext link, for linking corresponding data (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the pointer taught by Farrell to include hypertext links as taught by Binnig hypertext links are a means of creating pointers between data.

Regarding independent claims 10, 19 and 23, the claims reflect the system, computer program product and processor and memory for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected at least based on the rational of the rejection above.

Claims 2-8, 11-18, 20-22 and 24-26 depend from independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 23. Therefore claims 2-8, 11-18, 20-22 and 24-26 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Regarding independent claim 27, Applicants indicate that neither Farrell nor Binnig teach or suggest source code identifying an element of a graphical model and generating a document with information about the source code (p.7, para. 3). The Examiner disagrees because Farrell teaches generating source code identifying objects from an object model (col. 5, lines 16-17, 50-55; col. 6, lines 24-26) and generating a code file corresponding to the source code (col. 5, lines 32-36). In other words, source code containing codeblocks from objects in an object mode is generated and a code file is created based on the source code.

Applicants further argue that both Farrell and Binnig fail to teach or suggest providing, in a document, a hyperlink referencing the element of the graphical model (p.8, para. 1-2). The Examiner disagrees because Farrell teaches a pointer in the

source code referencing objects in the object model and a document created from the source code (col. 5, lines 32-36, 50-55) and Binnig teaches a hypertext link serving as a pointer (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-5). In other words, the hypertext link acting as a pointer, as taught in Binnig, could represent the pointer in the source code to the model, as taught in Farrell.

Claims 28-30 depend from independent claim 27. Therefore claims 28-30 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER